

PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT COUNTIES

Advisory Meeting

April 10, 2002

CDSS Training Center

815 S Street Sierra Room

Sacramento, California

1. Welcome – Joeana Carpenter greeted everyone.
2. Agenda Review – Joeana went over the agenda items and asked for any additional items.
3. Summary Review – Joeana asked if there were any additions or changes to the summary. Hector Hernandez indicated that Rich Terwilliger's name was misspelled; it was corrected.
4. CalWORKs – Warren Ghens discussed KinGAP. He said that for these types of cases, everyone was initially instructed to drop them; however, anything that is funded with TANF monies must be reviewed and data collected. Warren indicated that KinGAP cases consist of an AU size of one person. They are child only cases and in the adult level class, the adult is coded three in item T30. Holly Hamilton said that hardly any information on the adult is in the case record, which makes it difficult to obtain. At last count there were ten cases of this type in the last FFY. Peggy Usrey is looking at all the drop cases and has found six KinGAP for this current FFY.

Warren also indicated that as a result of cases timing out of the federal limits for assistance and transitioning into state assistance are not considered new applicant cases. Hopie Rios brought up a question regarding change of deprivation. She asked if the absent parent returns into the home and as a result, the deprivation changes, does this become a new applicant case. Warren indicated that this is not a new applicant case. There must be a break in aid of thirty days before a case can be considered a new applicant case and not an ongoing case, which has changed status.

Warren discussed an important topic, which is participation hours. Federal regulations dictate the methods by which states can calculate the hours associated with work activities. It is important that we get actual hours worked and divide by 4.3. There may be instance where days are not counted. Joeana asked the supervisors if they are not capturing the actual hours. Evalyn Epps described the ISAWS Welfare to Work system in her county, she indicated that she counts the actual hours. The supervisors indicated that they are using actual hours. Hopie Rios says that she requests the WtW case, and there may be instances where hours are not tabulated correctly, but she enters correct information in Q5i. Warren will send out a survey to identify how and what info counties are

using to get hours of work activity in order to prepare for the next FFY. He will send out the survey via email.

Warren talked about the draft ACL regarding the “Use of the Work Number Employment Verification for CalWORKs Program”. The ACL clarifies the role of the “Work Number” and addresses some question about its use to verify recipient employment and income. San Bernardino, Monterey, Merced, Orange, Los Angeles Field Operations Bureau are using the verification system. Hector Hernandez indicates that the list of employers that contract with the “Work Number” is extensive. Evalyn Epps said that the “The Work Number” is better than contacting the employer directly. There is an option to get all employers, but each county needs to check with their legal departments.

5. Food Stamps – Michael Bowman-Jones said that he received no comments on draft transmittals from PMC, but did get some from program.
He also indicated that there is a change in the FNS 310 section 753 dealing with Expedited Service. A case that has been identified as Expedited Service must be coded as such even though the case may not have been processed with the service. The question was raised on how is a regular case coded when it is processed with the expedited service.
ACTION ITEM:
Michael will check and report back at the next PMC meeting.
6. Food Stamp Federal Differences – Hector provided a report that he sent via the users group. Whenever, there is a federal difference he will provide the entire package at the PMC so that everyone can have a copy. Program has been informed about the difference case. He will discuss more about the case, as information becomes available.
7. QC Procedures Refresher Training – Michael Bowman- Jones indicated that he met with Sacramento State University Media representative to discuss best way to present training via video. The representative said that the earliest they could provide a product would be in September. Training sooner rather than later was the better approach for timing of the training, especially during the period of heightened awareness of the QC process. It was decided to preempt a PMC meeting, and have training on June 12th. An analyst as well as a supervisor or two analysts from each county would attend. The supervisors were asked who would not be able to bring two persons to the training. Some were not sure and would have to go back and ask their administrators. Richard asked that any county who could not send two persons to the training to notify him via email by Tuesday April 15th.

Action Item: Supervisors will send email to Richard if they are unable to send two persons to the training.

8. Corrective Action – Lisa Lacy said that she would be regularly attending the PMC meeting to share corrective action activities. She indicated that some counties went to Texas to see their operations and study that states best practices. She also indicated that there would be a meeting in Fresno to highlight best practices of counties such as Alameda and San Francisco. There is an ACL sent addressed to Welfare Directors and Corrective Action Coordinators with the meeting schedule. Reinvestment for FFY 2000 will be focussed on looking at projects. She indicated that the San Joaquin review is completed. She said that sixteen state corrective action staff involved in visiting a county. Hector Hernandez asked about obtaining an org chart of the unit. Lisa will bring organization responsibilities at the next meeting.
9. State Program Inquiry Process – Varaniece Hall distributed ACIN I-29-01 titled Food Stamp Policy Implementation Unit Assignments and Guidelines for Requesting Policy Interpretations. Using this format described in the ACL as a basis, the supervisors agreed upon a process for requesting information regarding pending QC error questions. Typically, at an error review team meeting questions regarding policy arise on a case cited with an error. At that time after both the situation that caused the error and the question to be posed to program have been clarified by the QC supervisor and the County Program, either the QC supervisor or the county program analyst will send the question to state program and cc all the pertinent staff involved. The inquiry will be flagged 'QC/CA Error' so state program can give this inquiry priority. All agreed that this would provide faster and consistent information on error cases.

Action Item: Varaniece will develop a form to be used for the QC inquiry and send it to Richard who will distribute via the Q5 user egroup.

10. Best Practices – Hopie Rios and Nancy Monson facilitated the discussion on the counties best practices for rereviewing cases. Tom Broderick and Rosalie Roca shared as well as facilitated the discussion on QA/QC interface activities in each of the counties. A list of best practices for the rereview process was contained in the survey conducted earlier this year and was emailed to all PMC participants at that time. QA/QC interface best practices are attached to this summary.
11. Regional Reports – Gerry Greer indicated that issues were covered at this meeting.

10.